

Archaeological Resources Issue Team
Meeting Agenda and Notes
Redmond Library, Feb. 6, 2002

Issue Team members present: Ron Gregory (BLM IT lead), Susan Gray, Sally Bird, Ward Tonsfeldt, Katy Yoder, Mollie Chaudet (BLM plan lead).

The following constitute the agenda items for the Feb. 6 meeting:

1. Ground Rules (revisited)
2. Privacy Notification
3. Change to planning area boundary
4. Significant archaeological sites
5. Review future desired condition
6. Identify methods
7. Change to Feb. 20 meeting
8. Open public forum

Notes relative to agenda:

1. Ground Rules: Since only two people were present at the IT meeting that established ground rules, it seemed prudent to revisit those rules to see if everything had been captured. Outside of questions and explanations relative to the meaning of “rabbit trails” and the amount of time allotted for the public at the end of meetings team members were in agreement that the existing ground rules should stand.
2. Privacy Notification: A message addressing a “privacy notification” had been circulated around to BLM IDT members. The purpose of that message was to bring to the attention of the IT leads that they need to inform IT members of the “notification”. That notification reads as follows: “Names of Issue Team members will be included in the draft and final EIS. Addresses will be provided on request, unless you specifically request that we not release them. Also, we would like to share Issue Team member E-mail and phone numbers with all other Issue Team members. If you do not want us to share you E-mail and/or phone with other Issue Team members, please let us know”. A hand-out was passed around to IT members at the Feb. 6 meeting for their review. IT members, Susan Gray and Ward Tonsfeldt, signed a written notice saying they did not want their mailing address, phone number, or email address released to the “public, press, or media”.
3. Change to planning area boundary: Mollie provided the IT members an explanation about the proposal for expanding the planning area boundary on the south side of Prineville Reservoir, i.e., similar urban interface issues. After that explanation and ensuing brief discussion, IT members agreed that the proposed

expansion would have little, if any, effect to the archaeological resources issue or time needed to analyze the area.

4. **Significant Archaeological Resources:** This agenda item was introduced to help IT members better understand the intent of the archaeological resources issue for the planning effort. In other words the issue is not addressing the entire universe of cultural resources that are located across the planning area (those are covered by various legislation, EO's, policies, etc) but rather those "significant" archaeological resources that may be threatened or "at-risk" due to one or more of a variety of impacts. To help clarify "significant" sites, Ron Gregory provided copies of the National Register Criteria for Evaluation of sites and the Seven Aspects of Integrity. That information was copied from pages 2 and 3 of CRM, Vol. 18 (supplement) No. 6 (published by the National Park Service).
5. **Review "future desired condition":** This agenda item had, originally, been drafted at the January 16 IT meeting (where only two people attended) and further refined for the January 29 all IT meeting (where only three IT members were present). As a result of those meetings the "future desired condition" for archaeological conditions within the planning area was as follows: "1) Historic wagon road segments located east of the communities of Bend and Redmond, west of the Powell Butte Highway and south of Highway 126 are protected and interpreted. 2) Structures and features of the old Tumalo Canal located east of Barr Road, west of the Cline Falls Highway and south of Cline Buttes are developed and interpreted for its archaeological, geological, wildlife, and recreational values. 3) Redmond Caves are protected and interpreted to provide for their scientific, sociocultural, and public uses and values. Because of limited participation at the Jan. 16 and 29 meetings the agenda item was revisited at the Feb. 6 IT meeting. The IT discussion at the Feb. 6 meeting indicated that the statement was too specific and tended to repeat itself in terms of protection, interpretation, development, etc. In view of those considerations the team initially came up with the following "desired condition": "Significant prehistoric and historic archaeological resources that are threatened or "at-risk" by various impacts should be identified, protected, preserved, and interpreted for their scientific, sociocultural, public, and interpretive values". After further discussion the team agreed that the "desired condition" should read: "Criteria are established for identifying and prioritizing "at-risk" significant archaeological resources for protection, interpretation, and/or development". It was agreed that the specificity noted in the original desired conditions would be elaborated on in the methods by which archaeological resources are protected, interpreted, developed.
6. **Identify Methods:** The team worked at developing a preliminary table of criteria for what constitutes "at risk" significant archaeological resources. The criteria was an initial attempt at identifying those resources, the kinds of impacts they might be subject to, a risk-rating system of high, moderate, and low, and possible mitigation measures. The team agreed that Ron Gregory would do further work on that table and then send it out to Katy Yoder to route to the rest of the IT

members for review and possible refinement in preparation for the Feb. 27 IT meeting.

7. Change to Feb. 20 meeting date: The meeting scheduled for Feb. 20 has been rescheduled to be held on Feb. 27. The meeting will be from 1-4 in the Historical Room at the Redmond Library.
8. Open public forum: There were no non-IT members of the public present at the meeting.